



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SE .
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,968	12/06/2001	Karl Jacob	4704P010X	7335
8791	7590	01/26/2005	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			BHATIA, AJAY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2145	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,968

Applicant(s)

JACOB ET AL.

Examiner

Ajay M Bhatia

Art Unit

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3-31-04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. Claims 1-26 are pending.
2. Claims 1-26 are rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. Claim 12 recites the limitation "The computer readable storage medium of claim 10" in the 1st line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purposes of this office action claim 12 will depend from claim 11. Applicant is required to make an appropriate correction.

Double Patenting

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

5. Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11, 13-16, 19, and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1-15, and 18-24 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,636,590. This is a double patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 3, 8, 11, 13, 19, 21-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rothschild et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0003867 referred to as Rothschild).

7. For claim 1, Rothschild teaches, a method comprising:
receiving an audio request, via an audio-transmission medium, from a user seeking service providers from a wide array of fields of service;

when the audio request includes a field of service desired by the user, providing the user with an audio list of one or more service providers stored in a service provider database which match the field of service desired by the user;

determining a selection from the user for a selected service provider stored within the service provider database; and

connecting the user with the selected service provider for a live conversation via the audio transmission medium. (see Rothschild, paragraph 12 and figure 1)

8. For claim 3, Rothschild teaches, the method of claim 1, further comprising:

receiving a request from a service provider of a field of service for inclusion in the service provider database; and

when the service provider is approved for inclusion in the service provider database, generating a record in the service provider database, the record including provider information contained in the request, wherein the provider information includes one or more of a service price, real-time service provider availability, specific expertise of the service provider, languages spoken by the service provider and a quality rating for the service provider. (see Rothschild, paragraphs 14 thru 23, 39 and 40)

9. For claim 8, Rothschild teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein prior to the receiving the audio request, the method further comprises:

receiving a request from a user for connection to a voice-portal service provider system via the audio transmission medium;

establishing a connection between the user and the voice-portal service provider system in order to provide the user with a live connection with a chosen service provider;

providing the user with an audio list of the wide array of fields of service available from the audio portal service provider system; and

providing the user with a unique audio field of service code corresponding to each field of service within the audio list of fields of service, such that the user can enter a field of service code on a keypad of the user audio transmission medium to select a desired field of service. (see Rothschild, paragraph 12 and figure 1)

10. Claims 11, 13, and 19 list all the same elements of claims 1, 3, and 8 but in product form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claimed 1, 3, and 8 applies equally as well to claims 11, 13, and 19.

11. For claim 21, Rothschild teaches, an audio portal service provider system comprises:

an audio transmission medium to connect a user to the system;

an audio recognition engine for receiving an audio request from the user for a service provider stored in a service provider database; and

a processor to receive a selection from the user for a selected provider from the audio recognition engine, and connect the user with the selected service provider for a live conversation via the audio transmission medium. (see Rothschild, paragraph 12 and figure 1)

12. For claim 22, Rothschild teaches, the system of claim 21, further comprising:
a system interface to provide the user with an audio list of available fields of service providers, accept a field of service desired by the user, provide the user with a list of one or more service providers stored in a service provider database which match the field of service desired by the user, and a receive a selection from the user for a selected provider. (see Rothschild, paragraph 12 and figure 1)
13. For claim 23, Rothschild teaches, the system of claim 21, further comprising:
a provider interface for receiving a request from a service provider of a field of service for inclusion in the service provider database, and generate a record in the service provider database, the record including provider information contained in the request. (see Rothschild, paragraphs 42 thru 50)
14. For claim 24, Rothschild teaches, the system of claim 23, wherein the provider information includes one or more of a service price, real-time service provider availability, specific expertise of the service provider, languages spoken by the service provider and a quality rating for the service provider. (see Rothschild, paragraphs 14 thru 23, 39 and 40)
15. For claim 26, Rothschild teaches, the system of claim 21, wherein audio transmission medium further comprises:

a wireless communications network interface to connect a user to the system.

(see Rothschild, paragraph 15)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothschild in view of Alpdemir (U.S. Patent 6,658,389).

17. For claim 9, Rothschild fails to teach, the method of claim 1, wherein following the connecting the user with the selected service provider, the method further comprises:

once the live conversation between the user and the selected service provider is complete, prompting the user for a quality of service rating for services rendered by the service provider; and

recording the service rating provided by the user in the service provider database.

Alpdemir teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein following the connecting the user with the selected service provider, the method further comprises:

once the live conversation between the user and the selected service provider is complete, prompting the user for a quality of service rating for services rendered by the service provider; and

recording the service rating provided by the user in the service provider database. (see Alpdemir, Col. 11 line 60 to Col. 12 line 33)

It would be obvious of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system of Rothschild with the method of Alpdemir because both disclose providing information about restaurants. (see Rothschild, paragraph 3) and (see Alpdemir, Col. 1 lines 24-45)

18. Claims 2, 7, 10, 12, 17, 20, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothschild in view of Shaffer et al. (U.S. Patent 5,901,214 referred to as Shaffer).

19. For claim 2, Rothschild teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein providing the user with an audio list of service providers further comprises:

when the audio request includes a voice request for a field of service desired by the user, converting the voice request into a database query language format utilizing interactive voice recognition software; (see Rothschild, paragraphs 42 thru 50)

Rothschild fails to teach, when the audio request from the user includes a keypad entry response from the user, converting a signal generated by the user's keypad entry into a database query language format in order to enable selection of service providers matching the field of service desired by the user from the service provider database; and

querying the service provider database according to the generated query of the field of service desired by the user in order to generate a list of one or more service providers matching the user's desired field of service.

when the audio request from the user includes a keypad entry response from the user, converting a signal generated by the user's keypad entry into a database query language format in order to enable selection of service providers matching the field of service desired by the user from the service provider database; and

querying the service provider database according to the generated query of the field of service desired by the user in order to generate a list of one or more service providers matching the user's desired field of service. (see Shaffer, Col. 3 lines 3-15, Col. 20 line 59 to Col. 21 line 10)

It would be obvious of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the system of Rothschild with the method of Shaffer because both systems make use of voice recognition systems. (see Shaffer, Col. 1 line 47 to Col. 2 line 6) and (see Rothschild, paragraph 5)

20. For claim 7, Rothschild-Shaffer teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein the audio request from the user is one of a voice request and a keypad entry response and includes one or more of a category of service providers, a service provider price, service provider availability, service provider specific expertise, service provider language and a service provider minimum quality rating. (see Shaffer, Col. 3 lines 3-15, Col. 20 line 59 to Col. 21 line 10) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 7.

21. For claim 10, Rothschild-Shaffer teaches, the method of claim 1, wherein determining a selection from the user further comprises:

when the user audio request includes a voice request, converting the voice request into a database query language format using integrated voice recognition software to determine the service provider selected by the user;

when the user audio request includes a keypad entry response, converting a signal generated by the keypad entry response into a database query language format in order to determine the service provider selected by the user; and querying the service provider database according to the generated query to select the service provider desired by the user to enable connection between the user and the desired service provider. (see Shaffer, Col. 3 lines 3-15, Col. 20 line 59 to Col. 21 line 10) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 10.

22. Claims 12, 17, and 20 list all the same elements of claims 2, 7, and 10 but in system form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claims 2, 7, and 10 applies equally as well to claims 12, 17, and 20.

23. For claim 25, Rothschild-Shaffer teaches, the system of claim 21, wherein audio transmission medium further comprises:

a public switched telephone network interface to connect a user to the system.
(see Shaffer, Col. 3 lines 3-15)The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 25, applies equally as well to claim 25.

24. Claims 4-6 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rothschild.

25. For claim 4, Rothschild teaches, the method of claim 1, further comprising:

billing the user for the live conversation with the selected service provider; and
compensating the selected service provider for the live conversation with the user. (see Rothschild, paragraph 29 thru 37)

It would be obvious of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to allow charging of the user or any other person, since changes the bill to process.

26. For claim 5, Rothschild teaches, the method of claim 4, wherein the billing the user further comprises:

measuring a duration of the live conversation between the user and the selected service provider; and
calculating a billing amount for the user based on the duration of the live conversation and a time-based price charged by the selected service provider. (see Rothschild, paragraph 29 thru 37) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 4, applies equally as well to claim 5.

27. For claim 6, Rothschild teaches, the method of claim 4, wherein the billing the user further comprises:

calculating a billing amount for the user based on a flat fee charged by the service provider. (see Rothschild, paragraph 29 thru 37) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 4, applies equally as well to claim 6.

28. Claims 14-16 list all the same elements of claims 4-6, but in system form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claims 4-6 applies equally as well to claim 14-16.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. US-6,636,590 by Jacob et al.

Art Unit: 2145

2. US-6,055,513 by Katz et al.
3. US-6,625,595 by Anderson et al.
4. US-6,173,279 by Levin et al.
5. US-6,404,877 by Bolduc et al.
6. US-6,757,364 by Newkirk, Darrel
7. US-5,596,634 by Fernandez et al.
8. US-5,574,780 by Andruska et al.
9. US-5,960,416 by Block, Robert S.
10. US-5,615,213 by Griefer, Allan D.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ajay M Bhatia whose telephone number is (571)-272-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Harvey can be reached on (571)-272-3896. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

AB

Jack Hays
JACK HAYS
SUPERVISOR, FINANCIAL EXAMINER